

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 PRIUM DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LLC, a
10 Washington limited liability company; and
11 PRIUM WHITE CENTER BUILDING LLC, a
12 Washington limited liability company,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 NATIONAL REALTY DEVELOPMENT
16 CORPORATION, a Maryland corporation,

17 Defendant.

CASE NO. C09-0103-JCC

ORDER

18 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint (Dkt.
19 No. 20), and Plaintiffs' Reply (Dkt. No. 26). Defendant has filed no opposition in response to the
20 motion. The Court has carefully considered the motion and the balance of pertinent materials in the case
21 file and has determined that oral argument is not necessary. The Court finds and rules as follows.

22 The Court has summarized the background facts of this dispute in its January 30, 2009, Order
23 denying Plaintiffs' motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (Dkt. No. 11) and will not repeat those
24 facts here. In the instant motion, Plaintiffs move the Court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
25 15 for leave to amend the Complaint to add a claim for unjust enrichment under state law. (Mot. 1 (Dkt.
26 No. 20).)

The Federal Rules provide that where, as here, a party has already been served with a responsive

1 pleading, “a party may amend its pleading only with the opposing party’s written consent or the court’s
2 leave. The court should freely give leave when justice so requires.” FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a)(2). The Court
3 finds that in the interests of justice, Plaintiffs’ motion shall be GRANTED. Plaintiffs are DIRECTED to
4 file forthwith an amended complaint.

5 SO ORDERED this 5th day of March, 2009.

6
7
8 
9 _____
10 John C. Coughenour
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25